

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Clarence Spann, # 326745, |) | C/A No. 8:08-3399-CMC-BHH |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | Report and Recommendation |
| |) | |
| County of Spartanburg, |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

Background of this Case

The plaintiff is an inmate at the Watkins Pre-Release Center of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. The South Carolina Department of Corrections website (www.doc.sc.gov) indicates that the plaintiff is serving an eighteen-month sentence for possession of tools for crime. The plaintiff's conviction was entered in the Court of General Sessions for Richland County in February of 2008. The plaintiff's projected release date is November 2, 2008.

In the above-captioned case, the plaintiff has brought suit against Spartanburg County for the "Method of Sentencing[.]" (Complaint, at page 2 [Answer to Question 2(B)]). The "STATEMENT OF CLAIM" portion of the § 1983 complaint contains two sentences:

I Clarence Spann is [*sic*] not in dispute of my sentence. But
the way I was Sentence [*sic*] is in question!

(Complaint, at page 3). Part V of the § 1983 complaint is left blank, although the plaintiff has signed the complaint and has indicated the date on which he signed the complaint.

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review¹ has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979) (recognizing the district court's authority to conduct an initial screening of any *pro se* filing);² *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). The plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, ___ U.S. ___, 75 U.S.L.W. 3643, 167 L.Ed.2d 1081, 127 S.Ct. 2197 (2007)(*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is

¹Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (DSC), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

²*Boyce* has been held by some authorities to have been abrogated in part, on other grounds, by *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989) (insofar as *Neitzke* establishes that a complaint that fails to state a claim, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), does not by definition merit *sua sponte* dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)], as “frivolous”).

evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, the plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). Even under this less stringent standard, the § 1983 complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Since the plaintiff is challenging the "Method of Sentencing" in a criminal case in state court, the above-captioned civil rights action is subject to summary dismissal because a right of action has not accrued. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994):

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such a determination, or called into question by a federal court's issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. at 486-487 (footnote omitted). *See also Woods v. Candela*, 47 F.3d 545 (2nd Cir. 1995) (litigant's conviction reversed by state court in 1993; hence, civil rights action timely filed); *Treece v. Village of Naperville*, 903 F. Supp. 1251 (N.D. Ill.

1995); *Seaton v. Kato*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2380, *12-*13, 1995 WL 88956 (N.D. Ill., Feb. 28, 1995); and *Smith v. Holtz*, 879 F. Supp. 435 (M.D. Pa. 1995), *affirmed*, 87 F.3d 108 (3rd Cir. 1995).

Until the plaintiff's conviction from Spartanburg County³ is set aside or vacated, any civil rights action based on the conviction, sentence, direct appeal, and related matters will be barred because of the holding in *Heck v. Humphrey*. *Sufka v. Minnesota*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84544, 2007 WL 4072313 (D. Minn., Nov. 15, 2007). Even so, the limitations period will not begin to run until the cause of action accrues. *See Benson v. New Jersey State Parole Board*, 947 F. Supp. 827, 830 & n. 3 (D.N.J. 1996) (following *Heck v. Humphrey*: "[b]ecause a prisoner's § 1983 cause of action will not have arisen, there need be no concern that it might be barred by the relevant statute of limitations."); and *Snyder v. City of Alexandria*, 870 F. Supp. 672, 685-88 (E.D. Va. 1994).

The Supreme Court of South Carolina, the Court of Appeals of South Carolina, Courts of General Sessions, Courts of Common Pleas, Family Courts, Probate Courts, magistrate's courts, and municipal courts are in a unified judicial system. *See* S.C. Const. Article V, § 1 ("The judicial power shall be vested in a unified judicial system, which shall include a Supreme Court, a Court of Appeals, a Circuit Court, and such other courts of uniform jurisdiction as may be provided for by general law."); *City of Pickens v. Schmitz*, 297 S.C. 253, 376 S.E.2d 271, 272 (1989); and *Cort Industries Corp. v. Swirl, Inc.*, 264 S.C. 142, 213 S.E.2d 445, 446 (1975). The entity known as the South Carolina Court

³As earlier stated, the plaintiff, according to the South Carolina Department of Corrections website, is currently confined on a conviction entered in Richland County. The current record before the court does not disclose the nature of the sentencing that took place in Spartanburg County.

Administration operates the State of South Carolina's unified judicial system pursuant to the authority delegated by the Supreme Court of South Carolina. See *Bailey v. State*, 309 S.C. 455, 424 S.E.2d 503 (1992).

Spartanburg County cannot be held liable for actions of the Court of General Sessions for Spartanburg County. It can be judicially noticed that, in South Carolina, a County's authority over courts within its boundaries was abolished when Article V of the Constitution of the State of South Carolina was ratified in 1973. See Act No. 58, 1973 S.C. Acts 161; S.C. Const. Art. V, § 1; and *State ex rel. McLeod v. Civil and Criminal Court of Horry County*, 265 S.C. 114, 217 S.E.2d 23, 24 (1975).⁴

Under the current version of S.C. Const. Art. V, § 1, the Supreme Court of South Carolina, not Spartanburg County, retains the *sole* authority to supervise magistrates' courts, municipal courts, Family Courts, Probate Courts, and Courts of General Sessions in Spartanburg County. See *Spartanburg County Dept. of Social Services v. Padgett*, 296 S.C. 79, 370 S.E.2d 872, 875-76 & n. 1 (1988). By virtue of Article V, a County does not exercise administrative or supervisory authority over municipal courts, magistrates' courts, or courts of the State of South Carolina located within the geographical boundaries of the particular County. Moreover, Spartanburg County is not responsible for actions of the Seventh Circuit Solicitor in a criminal case because Spartanburg County does not hire or supervise the Solicitor, who "hires and fires" Assistant Solicitors. *Anders v. County Council*

⁴County courts in the State of South Carolina no longer exist. Section 22 of Article V of the Constitution of the State of South Carolina (1973) allowed "any existing court" on the date of ratification to continue operating until Article V was fully implemented. *State ex rel. McLeod v. Civil and Criminal Court of Horry County*, 217 S.E.2d at 24 ("The Horry County Court is one of the courts continued in existence solely by virtue of the provisions of Section 22 of Article V.").

for *Richland County*, 284 S.C. 142, 325 S.E.2d 538 (1985). Consequently, Spartanburg County should be dismissed because it is not responsible for the alleged violations of the plaintiff's rights during the relevant times at issue in the above-captioned case.

As earlier stated, Part V, which is the relief portion of the complaint, is left blank, except for the plaintiff's signature and date. When a plaintiff has failed to ask for relief, a federal district court "is faced with the prospect of rendering an advisory opinion; federal courts may not render advisory opinions, however." *Humphreys v. Renner*, 1996 WL 88804 (N.D. Cal., Feb. 26, 1996), following *FCC v. Pacifica Foundation*, 438 U.S. 726, 735 (1978) ("[F]ederal courts have never been empowered to issue advisory opinions."). See also *Public Service Co. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency*, 225 F.3d 1144, 1148 n. 4 (10th Cir. 2000) (company's failure to ask for relief constitutes a request for an advisory opinion, which is barred by Article III). Cf. *Herb v. Pitcairn*, 324 U.S. 117, 126 (1945) ("We are not permitted to render an advisory opinion[.]");⁵ and *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 322-330 (*held*: although district courts should not blur the distinction between the standards applicable to a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and a dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 because a claim is frivolous, a patently insubstantial complaint, petition, or pleading may be dismissed). Cf. *United States v. Burlington Northern Railroad Co.*, 200 F.3d 679, 699 (10th Cir. 1999) (refusing to respond to party's "request for guidance in future cases" because the request was "tantamount to a request for an advisory opinion").

⁵Other portions of the decision in *Herb v. Pitcairn* have been superannuated by later case law. See *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032 (1983).

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez*; *Neitzke v. Williams*; *Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 (4th Cir. 1993); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) [essentially a redesignation of "old" § 1915(d)]; and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal]. The plaintiff's attention is directed to the Notice on the next page.

October 14, 2008
Greenville, South Carolina

s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States Magistrate Judge

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); and *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).